

AperTO - Archivio Istituzionale Open Access dell'Università di Torino

Non-target host risk assessment for the parasitoid *Torymus sinensis*

This is the author's manuscript

Original Citation:

Availability:

This version is available <http://hdl.handle.net/2318/1531080> since 2016-10-12T09:58:42Z

Published version:

DOI:10.1007/s10526-015-9676-1

Terms of use:

Open Access

Anyone can freely access the full text of works made available as "Open Access". Works made available under a Creative Commons license can be used according to the terms and conditions of said license. Use of all other works requires consent of the right holder (author or publisher) if not exempted from copyright protection by the applicable law.

(Article begins on next page)



UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI TORINO

The final publication is available at Springer via <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10526-015-9676-1> (DOI 10.1007/s10526-015-9676-1)

1 Non-target host risk assessment for the parasitoid *Torymus sinensis*

2

3

4

5

6 **Abstract**

7 *Torymus sinensis* Kamijo (Hymenoptera: Torymidae) has been released throughout Italy for
8 biological control of the chestnut gall wasp. In response to concern about non-target impacts
9 associated with the introduction of this exotic biological control agent, this study aimed at
10 investigating *T. sinensis*'s host range. In total, 1,371 non-target galls were collected in north-central
11 Italy in a two-year period, representing nine different species. Collections were carried out on
12 common oak, downy oak, sessile oak, Turkey oak, and wild rose.

13 A total of five native torymid species were recorded from the non-target galls (*Megastigmus*
14 *dorsalis*, *Torymus affinis*, *T. auratus*, *T. flavipes*, and *T. geranii*), and three ♂♂ *T. sinensis*
15 individuals emerged from *Biorhiza pallida* galls collected in the field. Under controlled conditions,
16 most of the non-target galls tested were not suitable hosts for oviposition. *T. sinensis* females only
17 laid eggs on *Andricus curvator*. In olfactometer bioassays, higher numbers of *T. sinensis* females
18 showed more interest to the chestnut galls compared to non-target hosts. This data highlights how *T.*
19 *sinensis* has a broader ecological host range than reported in the literature and that it is attracted by
20 non-target hosts other than *D. kuriphilus*.

23 Keywords: *Torymus sinensis*, risk assessment, host specificity, chestnut gall, oak gall

32 **Introduction**

33 Biological control of arthropod pests, weeds and plant diseases has been practiced for centuries. It is
34 a cost-effective, environmentally friendly approach to resolve pest problems in terrestrial and
35 aquatic ecosystems. Classical biological control, in particular, involves selecting natural enemies of
36 invasive species in their native range and releasing them in a recently invaded environment. It can
37 assure lasting, highly selective, and effective pest control (McEvoy 1996), but in addition to
38 providing a long-term benefit, the dispersal and permanent establishment of a beneficial insect for
39 biological control leads to an irreversible situation with the potential to cause negative
40 consequences to species other than the target pest (Andreassen et al. 2009; Brodeur 2012).

41 Prey/host specificity appears to be one of the most variable biological traits of biocontrol agents;
42 natural enemies currently used in biological control programmes may show various degrees of
43 specificity, ranging from organisms having a narrow host range restricted to a single species or
44 genus to those with a wide spectrum of potential hosts covering several orders, classes or even
45 kingdoms. Specificity primarily establishes the intrinsic potential of a given species to become an
46 efficient safe natural enemy of a target pest (Brodeur 2012). **Risks to** non-target species from
47 biological control programmes were already noted in the 1980s; issues concern the risks, if any, that
48 biological control agents introduced to new countries may pose, causing a decline in species that are
49 not the target pest (Howarth, 1991; Strand and Obrick 1996; Brodeur 2012).

50 *Torymus sinensis* Kamijo is a biological control agent of the chestnut gall wasp *Dryocosmus*
51 *kuriphilus* Yasumatsu that has been distributed in Japan (1975), the USA (in the late 1970s), Italy
52 (2005), and France (2011) (Moriya et al. 1989; Cooper and Rieske 2007; Quacchia et al. 2008;
53 Borowiec et al. 2014). It is reported in the literature as univoltine like its host, predominantly
54 reproducing amphigonically, even if recent evidence proved it may exhibit a prolonged diapause
55 mainly as late instar larva. After emergence, that takes place in early spring, and mating, the female
56 lays eggs inside the larval chamber of newly formed galls, usually one egg per host larva. After

57 hatching the larva feeds ectoparasitically on the host larva, and it pupates in the host larval chamber
58 during winter (Moriya et al., 1990; Ferracini et al. 2015).

59 The introduction of this parasitoid is widely known as one of the typical successful cases of
60 classical biological control in Japan and Italy too (Moriya et al. 2003; Ferracini et al. 2015);
61 however, the risks of the agent concerning potential negative effects on non-target native gall
62 makers mainly present on oaks (*Quercus* spp.) and closely related parasitoids have never been
63 evaluated thoroughly. Murakami et al. (1977) reported *T. sinensis*, among the Chinese parasitoids,
64 as the only species host specific and synchronous with the chestnut gall wasp, but we currently
65 know little about its host range and host specificity in its native or introduced ranges. A few limited
66 host range tests were carried out under laboratory conditions with alternative host galls from
67 *Mikiola fagi* Hartig (Diptera: Cecidomyiidae) , and on asexual generation of the oak gall wasps
68 *Cynips quercusfolii* L. and *Andricus kollari* Hartig (Hymenoptera: Cynipidae) in 2004 (Quacchia et
69 al. 2008), but no oviposition ever occurred. More preliminary tests with seven oak gall species [*A.*
70 *crispator* Tschek, *A. curvator* Hartig, *A. cydoniae* Giraud, *A. grossulariae* Giraud, *A. multiplicatus*
71 Giraud, *Biorhiza pallida* Olivier, and *D. cerriphilus* Giraud (Hymenoptera: Cynipidae)] were also
72 performed in 2014, supporting the specificity thesis further (Quacchia et al. 2014).

73 In response to concern about non-target impacts associated with the introduction of this exotic
74 biological control agent, the EFSA Panel on Plant Health established a new alternative host species
75 list for testing the host-specificity of *T. sinensis*, comprising galls which may be more susceptible to
76 attack during the period that females are searching for hosts, such as *A. curvator* sexual generation;
77 *A. cydoniae* sexual generation; *A. grossulariae* sexual generation; *A. inflator* sexual generation; *A.*
78 *lucidus* sexual generation; *A. multiplicatus* sexual generation; *B. pallida* sexual generation; *D.*
79 *cerriphilus* sexual and asexual generation; *Neuroterus quercusbaccarum* (L.) sexual generation)
80 (EFSA Panel On Plant Health 2010).

81 The present study aimed at investigating *T. sinensis*'s host range, with particular regard to the oak
82 galls species listed by EFSA Panel On Plant Health (2010). No choice trials were carried out

83 applying recently-developed protocols for host/prey range testing, considering the hypothesis that
84 species most closely related taxonomically and ecologically to the target are more likely to be
85 utilized as hosts by the biological control agent being tested (Kuhlmann et al. 2006; van Lenteren et
86 al. 2006). Furthermore, olfactometer bioassays were performed to assess the attractiveness of
87 volatiles for *T. sinensis* females; experiments were conducted to test the response of the parasitoid
88 comparing chestnut galls, reported in literature as the only target host, *versus* non target oak galls.

89 **Materials and methods**

90 Insect

91 All *T. sinensis* used in the trials emerged from parasitized chestnut galls randomly collected, by
92 hand from low branches (from ground level to 2 m high) and with the aid of lopping shears from the
93 medium-high tree crown (from 2 to 5 m high), once a year, in winter, both in 2013 and 2014 in
94 chestnut orchards in Piemonte region, where the parasitoid was first released in 2005 and then
95 successfully established. The galls were kept in cardboard boxes outdoors from January to April
96 until emergence of the parasitoids ($T_{min}=-1.9$, $T_{max}=16.3^{\circ}\text{C}$, $RH_{min}=67.8\%$, $RH_{max}=78.8\%$ in
97 2013; $T_{min}=0.8^{\circ}\text{C}$, $T_{max}=19.3^{\circ}\text{C}$, $RH_{min}=64.5\%$, $RH_{max}=81.1\%$ in 2014). Newly emerged
98 females were fed every 48 h with drops of honey on cardboard and individually kept in glass tubes
99 (120 mm in height by 18 mm in diameter), with no previous contact with a host, in a climatic
100 chamber at $15 \pm 1^{\circ}\text{C}$, $60 \pm 5\%$ RH, and a photoperiod of 16:8 (L:D) h.

101 Gall collection

102 Non-target galls were collected in 4 regions (2 sites per region): Liguria [Borzonasca (GE)
103 $44^{\circ}26'01.6''\text{N}$ $9^{\circ}23'45.9''\text{E}$, Sassello (SV) $44^{\circ}29'33.7''\text{N}$ $8^{\circ}33'17.9''\text{E}$], Piemonte [Molare (AL)
104 $44^{\circ}34'40.2''\text{N}$ $8^{\circ}36'10.5''\text{E}$, Pianfei (CN) $44^{\circ}19'41.2''\text{N}$ $7^{\circ}40'58.9''\text{E}$], Toscana [Marradi (FI)
105 $44^{\circ}04'53.1''\text{N}$ $11^{\circ}38'17.8''\text{E}$, Piazza al Serchio (LU) $44^{\circ}10'31.8''\text{N}$ $10^{\circ}17'14.9''\text{E}$], Valle d'Aosta
106 [Arnad (AO) $45^{\circ}38'22.7''\text{N}$ $7^{\circ}43'41.8''\text{E}$ Perloz $45^{\circ}36'53.9''\text{N}$ $7^{\circ}48'24.4''\text{E}$] (Figure 1).
107 Collections were carried out on common oak (*Quercus robur* L.), downy oak (*Q. pubescens*
108 Willdenow), sessile oak (*Q. petraea* (Mattuschka) Lieblein), Turkey oak (*Q. cerris* L.), and wild

109 rose (*Rosa* spp. L.). The selection of non-target oak hosts was based on the species list for host-
110 specificity testing established by EFSA Panel On Plant Health (2010), and host galls from the genus
111 *Rosa*, since their abundance in the wood, were tested as well as suggested by Gibbs et al. (2011).
112 Investigations were carried out over a 2-year period (2013–2014) in all regions and in the same
113 sites. Withered galls were collected in January-February in order to verify if *T. sinensis* may emerge
114 from non-target hosts, and fresh galls were collected in April-May (during *T. sinensis* emergence)
115 both on non-target hosts and chestnut trees (used as a control), to perform oviposition trials and
116 olfactometer bioassays under controlled conditions.

117 Sampled trees and shrubs were located in mixed forests close to infested chestnut stands where *T.*
118 *sinensis* was previously released in order to evaluate a potential shift from chestnut to non-target
119 hosts. In the Table 1 the years of release and the coordinates of *T. sinensis* release points are
120 provided. Collections were made by hand from low branches (from ground level to 2 m high) and
121 with the aid of lopping shears from the medium-high tree crown (from 2 to 5 m high). Galls were
122 stored in plastic bags, transferred immediately to the laboratory, and identified using voucher
123 specimens deposited at the DISAFA-Entomology laboratory.

124 Withered galls were individually isolated in plastic containers (70 mm in height by 55 mm in
125 diameter) with a fine-gauze lid, and stored outdoors within 24 hrs from collection. Containers were
126 checked weekly, and then daily after the first parasitoid emerged. Fresh galls were kept in climatic
127 chamber at 15 ± 1 °C, $60 \pm 5\%$ RH, and a photoperiod of 16:8 (L:D) h and used in the trials within 24
128 hrs from collection. Containers were kept outdoors from January to December until emergence of
129 the parasitoids ($T_{min} = -1.9$, $T_{max} = 29.1$ °C, $RH_{min} = 61.7\%$, $RH_{max} = 83.4\%$ in 2013; $T_{min} = 0.8$ °C,
130 $T_{max} = 26.3$ °C, $RH_{min} = 63.0\%$, $RH_{max} = 89.7\%$ in 2014) .

131 No choice oviposition trials

132 These tests, based on the ‘no choice black box test’ (van Lenteren et al. 2006), aimed to test *T.*
133 *sinensis*’s host range, investigating the parasitoid’s ability to develop in non-target hosts. No choice
134 exposures to non-target hosts were conducted in an enclosed arena in order to maximise the

likelihood of non-target attack. **Four** fresh oak gall species included in the EFSA list were tested in 2013 (*A. curvator*, *A. grossulariae*, *B. pallida*, and *N. quercusbaccarum*), and only two in 2014 (*A. curvator*, and *B. pallida*).

A single fresh non-target gall was offered to a 6-d-old naïve *T. sinensis* female placed on a wet filter paper inside a Petri dish (diameter, 10 cm) in order to obtain data on its behaviour in relation to parasitism, with a minimum of 20 replications for each gall species. Observations were performed using a stereomicroscope for 1 hour. Three behavioural sequences were recorded: host location, defined as a walk on the gall locating the host through vibrotaxis, attempted oviposition, defined as the attempted insertion of the ovipositor, and oviposition, defined as successful insertion of the ovipositor followed by the pumping action of the abdomen.

At the end of the observation the female was then removed from the arena and individually isolated in a Petri dish containing a fresh unparasitised chestnut gall as control, and the three behavioural sequences were recorded following the same procedure described above. All the tested galls were individually stored in glass tubes (120 mm in height by 18 mm in diameter), and then dissected with the aid of a scalpel using a stereomicroscope. Since eggs may have escaped detection, galls were stored in a climatic chamber at $24\pm 2^{\circ}\text{C}$, $50\pm 10\%$ RH, and a photoperiod of 16:8 (L:D) h for 10 days to ease the detection of the parasitoid at larval stage. All the trials were performed in laboratory conditions. **To avoid** any influence in the behaviour of the parasitoid, chestnut galls were collected in Alto Adige region in a site with no presence of *T. sinensis*. On the contrary, since during collection it was not possible to detect previously parasitised galls (e.g. by visual inspection), oak galls were discarded after the trials if any native parasitoid larva was identified by molecular analysis after dissection.

Olfactometer bioassays

In the olfactometer bioassays, 6-d-old *T. sinensis* females were used to assess their olfactory responses to the odours of the chestnut gall (used as a control) and 6 non-target galls (*A. curvator*, *A. cydoniae*, *A. grossulariae*, *A. multiplicatus*, *B. pallida*, *N. quercusbaccarum*) as alternative hosts.

161 Before the trials, the insects were individually kept at room temperature without any host in a glass
162 tube for 18 h with a humid cotton cap and microdrops of honey to acclimate the wasps to the
163 experimental conditions. The bioassays were carried out in a horizontal Y-shaped Pyrex tube
164 following the procedure described for another wasp, *Necremnus* spp. (Ferracini et al. 2012). The air
165 flow was provided by an air pump (Air 275R, Sera, Heinsberg, Germany) and then filtered in an
166 activated CO₂ filter, regulated with a flowmeter at 2.5 liters/min (EK-2NRK, Comer, Bologna,
167 Italy) and humidified in a 1-liter water bubbler half filled with deionized water. After the air flow
168 was established, a single parasitoid female was introduced into the entry arm. Each female was
169 observed until she had moved at least 2 cm up one of the side arms or until 10 min had elapsed. For
170 each test the same odour sources were used while concerning the wasps, a female was evaluated
171 only once to prevent any behaviour conditioned by experience. The odour sources chosen by
172 females that responded were recorded. Thirty responses were recorded for each pair of odour
173 sources. After testing five females, the odour sources were switched between the left-hand and
174 right-hand side arms to minimize any spatial effect on choices. The Y-tube and cameras were
175 cleaned with mild soap and alcohol (70% v) and sterilized in an autoclave at 120°C for 20 min. The
176 olfactory bioassays were conducted at 24±2°C, 50±10% RH, and 250±10 lux.

177 Parasitoid identification

178 Among all the parasitoids emerged from non-target hosts, only the torymid species were
179 morphologically identified using specific dichotomous keys (Kamijo 1982; de Vere Graham and
180 Gijswijt 1998) and by comparison with voucher specimens deposited at the DISAFA-Entomology
181 laboratory. Doubtful species and larvae recorded in dissected galls in the no choice oviposition
182 trials were submitted to DNA extraction and then sequenced for the cytochrome oxidase I (COI)
183 gene following Kaartinen et al. (2010).

184 Statistical analyses

185 In the behavioural trials the numbers of times that *T. sinensis* females engaged in three types of
186 behaviour (host location, attempted oviposition, and oviposition) were recorded, and means were

187 analyzed for each non-target gall to *D. kuriphilus* gall (as control) by paired t-tests for dependent
188 samples. In the olfactory bioassays, the responses of parasitoid females were analysed by a chi-
189 square test. The null hypothesis was that parasitoid females had a 50:50 distribution across the two
190 odour sources. All analyses were performed using SPSS version 20.0 (SPSS, Chicago, IL).

191 **Results**

192 In total, 1,371 non-target galls were collected over the 2-year period, corresponding to 4 different
193 genera: *Andricus*, *Biorhiza*, *Diplolepis*, and *Neuroterus* (Table 2). The galls found most frequently
194 were the sexual generations of *B. pallida* (856), while only 3 galls from *A. grossulariae* and 1 gall
195 from *A. lucidus* were recorded. A total of 707 native torymid specimens emerged from the isolated
196 galls, belonging to 5 species: *Megastigmus dorsalis*, *Torymus affinis*, *T. auratus*, *T. flavipes*, and *T.*
197 *geranii* (Table 3). The most frequent species was *T. flavipes* (381 specimens), while *M. dorsalis* (6
198 specimens), and *T. geranii* (3 specimens) were recorded sporadically. *B. pallida* galls proved to be
199 parasitized by all the parasitoid species recorded, except for *M. dorsalis*, which was recorded
200 emerging from galls of *A. cydoniae*, *A. lucidus*, and *A. multiplicatus*. *T. geranii* emerged only from
201 *B. pallida* galls, and the only species recorded emerging from *D. rosae* was *T. auratus*.

202 In addition to native torymid species, in 2013 a total of 3 ♂♂ *T. sinensis* individuals emerged from
203 non-target *B. pallida* galls collected in the Piemonte region in both surveyed sites (2 ♂♂ from
204 Pianfei and 1 ♂ from Molare). The cytochrome oxidase I gene obtained from the specimens
205 submitted to molecular identification was sequenced and sequences were compared with those in
206 the National Center for Biotechnology Information (NCBI) sequence database. In all cases, a
207 minimum of 99 % similarity with *T. sinensis*-related sequences was observed.

208 No other emergence of the exotic parasitoid was recorded for the other non-target oak galls nor for
209 *D. rosae* during the surveyed period (Table 3). All the torymid species emerged from the withered
210 non-target galls were collected between April and May, depending on the site.

211 No choice oviposition trials

212 In the no choice oviposition trials all the behavioural traits recorded on non-target and target hosts
 213 are reported in Table 4. In the close confinement imposed by the experimental design, *T. sinensis*
 214 females responded to all non-target and target species by locating and investigating the hosts. The
 215 number of host location events was significantly lower for *A. curvator* both in 2013 and 2014 (t
 216 test=-4.59; df=29; P<0.001 in 2013; t test=-2.99; df=29; P=0.008 in 2014), and for *A. grossulariae*
 217 (t test=-3.14; df=19; P=0.005), and *N. quercusbaccarum* (t test=-4.36; df=19; P<0.001) compared to
 218 the control, while for *B. pallida* no significant differences were revealed (t-test=-0.82; df=19;
 219 P=0.42 in 2013; t-test=-1.18; df=19; P=0.25 in 2014). Attempts of oviposition were observed when
 220 the parasitoid was offered *B. pallida* galls both in 2013 and in 2014 (t-test=1.83; df=19; P=0.08 in
 221 2013; t-test=1.79; df=19; P=0.09 in 2014), but no oviposition ever occurred.
 222 Only in 2014 both host location and oviposition was observed when the parasitoid was offered a
 223 non-target gall. In fact, 6 *T. sinensis* females out of the 20 tested showed interest in a non-target
 224 host, laying eggs in *A. curvator* galls (each female laid one egg per gall), although this was
 225 significantly lower than the number of *T. sinensis* females that subsequently oviposited on the
 226 control, *D. kuriphilus* galls (t-test=-3.25; df=19; P=0.004).
 227 In the non-target galls tested no native parasitoid was detected by molecular analysis carried out
 228 after dissection. In the control trials oviposition occurred in 96% of the chestnut galls tested.
 229 The cytochrome oxidase I gene obtained from each of the larvae found in the dissected galls, both
 230 on non-target and target hosts, was submitted to molecular identification, sequenced and the
 231 sequences compared with those in the National Centre for Biotechnology Information (NCBI)
 232 sequence database. In all cases, a minimum of 99% similarity with *T. sinensis*-related sequences
 233 was observed.

234 Olfactometer bioassays

235 In the olfactometer bioassays all the *T. sinensis* females tested responded by making a choice within
 236 the fixed time. Higher numbers of *T. sinensis* females were attracted to the chestnut galls compared
 237 to non-target hosts. In particular, significant differences in the responses of adults were found when

238 chestnut gall was compared to *A. cydoniae* ($\chi^2=6.53$; df=1; P=0.01), and *A. grossulariae* ($\chi^2=13.33$;
239 df=1; P<0.01), while for *A. curvator* ($\chi^2=3.33$; df=1; P=0.07), *A. multiplicatus* ($\chi^2=3.33$; df=1;
240 P=0.07), *B. pallida* ($\chi^2=3.33$; df=1; P=0.07), and *N. quercusbaccarum* ($\chi^2=2.13$; df=1; P=0.14) no
241 significant differences were observed (Figure 2).

242 **Discussion**

243 In recent years there has been growing concern about the potential or actual threat presented by
244 alien entomophagous biological control agents to populations of native non-target arthropod species
245 (López-Vaamonde and Moore 1998). The use of tests to assess plants as potential hosts for
246 herbivorous insects began over 70 years ago and has long been routine. In contrast, interest in
247 estimating parasitoid and predator host ranges has lagged considerably behind (van Driesche and
248 Murray 2004).

249 A full environmental risk assessment relies on the identification and evaluation of potential risks
250 associated with natural enemy release and the development of a plan to minimize them. That is why
251 in a classical biological program it is extremely important, prior to releasing the exotic natural
252 enemy, to identify, assess and weigh all adverse and beneficial effects in a risk-cost benefit
253 assessment (Gibbs et al. 2011).

254 The set of species that can support the development of a parasitoid or serve as prey for a predator—
255 observed under laboratory conditions exclusively—is defined as the fundamental host range of a
256 potential agent, also termed the physiological host range. In contrast, the ecological host range is
257 defined as the current and evolving set of host species actually used for successful reproduction in
258 the field (Onstad and Mcmanus 1996; Haye et al. 2005). **However**, assessment of the host range of a
259 biological control agent in the laboratory often yields a significantly broader fundamental host
260 range in comparison to the ecological host range (Haye et al. 2005), overestimating the field host
261 range. **Generally**, the results of the host specificity study constitute a key factor in the risk analysis
262 performed before an exotic beneficial arthropod can be safely utilized as a biological control agent.

263 In the last decade annual chestnut production in Italy underwent several drops, mainly ascribed to
264 adverse climatic conditions and pests. In particular, the Asian chestnut gall wasp has been
265 responsible for a severe reduction in fruiting, with yield losses estimated to reach between 65% and
266 85% in northern Italy (Bosio et al. 2013; Battisti et al. 2014), with a heavy economic impact on
267 Italian chestnut production.

268 From the first report of this pest in Italy in 2002, following the successful experiences in Japan and
269 North America, and due to the severity of the problem, pros and cons in the release of the exotic
270 parasitoid were balanced, and biological control was considered the only economically and
271 environmentally sustainable solution to deal with the pest promptly, since in the literature
272 alternative approaches (e.g. chemical treatments, resistant varieties) were all found infeasible. In its
273 native distribution, *D. kuriphilus* populations are controlled by natural enemies. In all the countries
274 invaded by the pest a rich parasitoid community has been reported, but the attack rates have
275 remained low (typically less than 2%) (Aebi et al., 2007; Gibbs et al., 2011; Quacchia et al., 2013).

276 Introductions of exotic organisms carry with it some unknown level of environmental risk, but these
277 risks must be weighed against the consequences of not initiating biological control, which can also
278 include serious environmental as well as economic consequences (Heimpel et al., 2004). The
279 releases of *T. sinensis* carried out aided in restoring a habitat to similar conditions as those observed
280 prior to the pest introduction, representing a large benefit for the chestnuts and chestnut growers.

281 Even though the host range of *T. sinensis* has never been studied or tested in detail in either its
282 native or introduced ranges over a long period of time, the parasitoid was considered specific to *D.*
283 *kuriphilus* (Murakami et al. 1977; Quacchia et al. 2014).

284 Nevertheless the host range of an apparently strictly monophagous parasitoid species may not be
285 constant, either in space or time; it could expand in environments with greater diversity and hence
286 have a larger number of new potential hosts (López-Vaamonde and Moore 1998). **Attacking** non-
287 target hosts is of concern due to the potential harm that exotic natural enemies may impose on
288 native or beneficial exotic species (Nadel et al. 2009). However, the risk to non-target species is

289 complex and difficult to estimate; guidelines for appropriate host range tests have been proposed by
290 the EFSA Panel on Plant Health (2010). Following this suggestion, our approach was to assess *T.*
291 *sinensis*'s capacity to attack and reproduce on non-target gall species inhabiting common habitat
292 with *Castanea* trees.

293 Even if, to date, no severe non-target effects have ever been reported in the literature after the
294 release of *T. sinensis*, this paper represents the first report of potential negative effects on non-target
295 native galls makers mainly present on oaks (*Quercus* spp.) by introducing the exotic parasitoid *T.*
296 *sinensis* as a biological control agent for the chestnut gall wasp, *D. kuriphilus*. In contrast to
297 Quacchia et al. (2008; 2014), who confirmed a high level of specificity for *T. sinensis* on the basis
298 of a set of non-target species tested, our study highlights how *B. pallida* oak galls proved to be
299 successfully parasitized. Even if the case record was low (3 galls parasitised by *T. sinensis* out of
300 856 collected in the field), this finding suggests that this oak gall species is a suitable host for the
301 exotic parasitoid. In 2013 the emergence of *T. sinensis* was recorded only from *B. pallida* galls
302 collected in both surveyed sites of Piemonte region; that is why, due to the considerable presence of
303 *B. pallida* in our environment, a mass collection of this gall species was performed in 2014, but no
304 other emergence was recorded. In the laboratory the conditions under which non-target tests are
305 conducted may also limit interpretation of the host range. Test arenas confine the parasitoid with the
306 host and may force encounters with non-target hosts, increasing the probability of the parasitoid
307 accepting completely factitious hosts (Mason et al. 2011). Nevertheless, in the no choice oviposition
308 trials, when they were offered to *T. sinensis* females oviposition only occurred in 2014 on *A.*
309 *curvator*; since galls were dissected to detect the presence of the larvae, no data is available about
310 their potential development to the adult stage. Some probing attempts were recorded on *B. pallida*,
311 but no oviposition ever occurred.

312 And in general, *T. sinensis* proved to be more attracted by chestnut galls compared to non-target
313 hosts, showing a similar responsiveness in the olfactometer bioassays as well. Statistical differences
314 were observed only for *A. cydoniae* and *A. grossulariae*, but the interest showed by the parasitoid

315 for *A. curvator*, *A. multiplicatus*, *B. pallida*, and *N. quercusbaccarum* have to be further
316 investigated.

317 In the oviposition trials, all the parasitoid females were naïve and tests were conducted only under
318 no choice conditions. In accordance with Withers and Brown (2005), no choice tests with both
319 naïve and oviposition-experienced females should be performed because it has been shown that
320 oviposition experience may either reduce or enhance responsiveness. Furthermore, since parasitoids
321 can display wider host ranges in choice tests, it would be useful to set up choice trials where the
322 parasitoid is given a choice of host and non-target host for a more accurate prediction of potential
323 host range. In fact, parasitoid response is generally expected to be biased toward the familiar host,
324 especially after the parasitoid successfully oviposits in it (Nadel et al. 2009).

325 In this study we confirmed that *T. sinensis* has a broader physiological host range than reported in
326 the literature and determined that it may be attracted by non-target hosts other than *D. kuriphilus*.

327 The assessment of risk requires consideration of the likelihood and magnitude of an effect and
328 evaluation of risk management priorities (Moeed et al., 2006). Methods for quantifying the
329 magnitude and spatiotemporal scale of impact of exotic natural enemies on populations of native
330 insects are crucial to advance current risk assessment (Wyckhuys et al., 2009), however, the
331 incidence of these host shift in the complex chestnut-oak is currently difficult to be quantified in the
332 natural environments.

333 Over the 2-year period, in order to monitor the potential emergence of *T. sinensis*, 8 oak gall species
334 suggested in the EFSA list were collected, while in the oviposition trials 4 non-target species out of
335 9 were tested. At present, research is ongoing to test *A. cydoniae*, *A. inflator*, *A. lucidus*, *A.*
336 *multiplicatus*, and *D. cerriphilus* in controlled conditions as possible hosts for *T. sinensis*, since they
337 provide the closest phenological match to the flight period of the parasitoid (i.e. between April and
338 May in Italy) (EFSA Panel On Plant Health Aebi et al., 2011). Further investigations need also to
339 be performed on *B. pallida*, given the emergence of the parasitoid from galls collected in the field
340 and the interest showed by some females in the oviposition trials.

341 Food availability is an important aspect that may influence the biological traits of many arthropods.
342 Recently a novel insight concerning *T. sinensis*'s life cycle was highlighted in this regard: a
343 prolongation of diapause was in fact reported. Even if it is hard to speculate what are the factors that
344 triggered this response, this may be read as an adaptive value to protect the population against the
345 yearly fluctuation in food supply (Ferracini et al. 2015). At present, there is growing evidence that
346 the *T. sinensis* parasitism rate is dramatically increasing in some Italian regions, almost reaching
347 98% in old release sites (Bosio et al., 2013), and parasitisation on non-target hosts was recorded
348 only in sites where a stable population of the exotic parasitoid is present, (Piemonte region), since
349 the first releases date back to 2005. Hence, a host-shift to oak galls may be due to the need to find
350 another suitable host since populations of the Asian chestnut gall wasp have recently declined
351 significantly (Ferracini et al. 2015), and even though the frequency of cases of observed non-target
352 impacts were small, major effects on non-target galls populations could be expected to be
353 detectable. Hence, longer term studies are necessary to allow more precise conclusions to be drawn
354 on non target impacts, that is why an exhaustive research about all potential non-target galls and
355 their phenology is needed in order to better understand the relationship between the exotic
356 parasitoid and native biocoenoses. At the same time, since in this paper four native *Torymus* species
357 emerged from non target galls during *T. sinensis* flight period as well, and in literature five native
358 species [*T. auratus*, *T. erucarum* (Schrank), *T. flavipes*, *T. geranii*, and *T. scutellaris* (Walker)] are
359 reported from chestnut galls (Alma et al., 2015), an evaluation of the potential for hybridization
360 between these congeneric species is also required in order to have a comprehensive knowledge of
361 the environmental risk to non-target species that *T. sinensis* may pose to native biodiversity.

362 **References**

- 363 Aebi A, Schönenberger N, Melika G, Quacchia A, Alma A, Stone GN (2007) Native and introduced
364 parasitoids attacking the invasive chestnut gall wasp *Dryocosmus kuriphilus*. EPPO Bull 37:
365 166-171
- 366 Aebi A, Schönenberger N, Bigler F (2011) Evaluating the use of *Torymus sinensis* against the
367 chestnut gall wasp *Dryocosmus kuriphilus* in Canton Ticino, Switzerland. Agroscope
368 Reckenholz-Tänikon Report, pp 71
- 369 Alma A, Ferracini C, Sartor C, Ferrari E, Botta R (2015) Il cinipide orientale del castagno: lotta
370 biologica e sensibilità varietale. Italus Hortus (in print)
- 371 Andreassen LD, Kuhulmann U, Mason PG, Holliday NJ (2009) Host range testing of a prospective
372 classical biological control agent against cabbage maggot, *Delia radicum*, in Canada. Biol
373 Control 48:210-220
- 374 Battisti A, Benvegnù I, Colombari F, Haack RA (2014) Invasion by the chestnut gall wasp in Italy
375 causes significant yield loss in *Castanea sativa* nut production. Agric Forest Entomol 16:75-79
- 376 Borowiec N, Thaon M, Brancaccio L, Warot S, Vercken E, Fauvergue X, Ris N, Malausa JC (2014)
377 Classical biological control against the chestnut gall wasp *Dryocosmus kuriphilus*
378 (Hymenoptera, Cynipidae) in France. Plant Prot Q 29(1):7-10
- 379 Bosio G, Armando M, Moriya S (2013) Verso il controllo biologico del cinipide del castagno.
380 Infotore Agrario 4(14):60-64
- 381 Brodeur (2012) Host specificity in biological control: insights from opportunistic pathogens. Evol
382 Appl 5:470-480
- 383 Castellini A, Palmieri A, Pirazzoli C (2009) Economic aspects of chestnut market in Italy. Acta
384 Horti 866:485-492
- 385 Cooper WR, Rieske LK (2007) Community associates of an exotic gallmaker, *Dryocosmus*
386 *kuriphilus* (Hymenoptera: Cynipidae), in Eastern North America. Ann Entomol Soc Am
387 100(2):236-244

388 de Vere Graham MWR, Gijswijt MJ (1998) Revision of the European species of *Torymus* Dalman
389 (s. Lat.) (Hymenoptera: Torymidae). Zool Verh Leiden 317:1-202

390 EFSA Panel on Plant Health (PLH) (2010) Risk assessment of the oriental chestnut gall wasp,
391 *Dryocosmus kuriphilus* for the EU territory on request from the European Commission. EFSA
392 J 8:1619

393 Ferracini C, Ingegno BL, Navone P, Ferrari E, Mosti M, Tavella L, Alma A (2012) Adaptation of
394 indigenous larval parasitoids to *Tuta absoluta* (Lepidoptera: Gelechiidae) in Italy. J Econ
395 Entomol 105:1311-1319

396 Ferracini C, Gonella E, Ferrari E, Saladini MA, Picciau L, Tota F, Pontini M, Alma A (2015) Novel
397 insight in the life cycle of *Torymus sinensis*, biocontrol agent of the chestnut gall wasp.
398 BioControl, 60: 169-177.

399 Gibbs M, Schönrogge K, Alma A, Melika G, Quacchia A, Stone GN, Aebi A (2011) *Torymus*
400 *sinensis*: a viable management option for the biological control of *Dryocosmus kuriphilus* in
401 Europe? BioControl 56:527-538

402 Haye T, Goulet H, Mason PG, Kuhlmann U (2005) Does fundamental host range match ecological
403 host range? A retrospective case study of a *Lygus* plant bug parasitoid. Biol Control 35:55-67

404 Heimpel GE, Ragsdale DW, Venette R, Hopper KR, O'Neil RJ, Rutledge CE, Wu Z (2004)
405 Prospects for Importation Biological Control of the Soybean Aphid: Anticipating Potential
406 Costs and Benefits. Ann Entomol Soc Am 97(2): 249-258

407 Howarth FG (1991) Environmental impacts of classical biological control. Annu Rev Entomol
408 36:485-509

409 Kaartinen R, Stone GN, Hearn J, Lohse K, Roslin T (2010) Revealing secret liaisons: DNA
410 barcoding changes our understanding of food webs. Ecol Entomol 35:623-638

411 Kamijo K (1982) Two new species of *Torymus* (Hymenoptera, Torymidae) reared from
412 *Dryocosmus kuriphilus* (Hymenoptera, Cynipidae) in China and Korea. Kontyû 50:505-510

413 Kuhlmann U, Schaffner U, Mason PG (2006) Selection of nontarget species for host-specificity
 414 testing. In: Bigler F, Babendreier D, Kuhlmann U (eds) Environmental impact of invertebrates
 415 for biological control of arthropods: methods and risk assessment. CABI Publishing,
 416 Wallingford, UK, pp 15-37

417 López-Vaamonde C, Moore D (1998) Developing methods for testing host specificity of
 418 *Phymastichus coffea* LaSalle (Hym.: Tetrastichinae), a potential biological control agent of
 419 *Hypothenemus hampei* (Ferrari) (Col.: Scolytidae) in Colombia, Biocontrol Sci Technol
 420 8(3):397-411

421 Mason PG, Broadbent AB, Whistlecraft JW, Gillespie DR (2011) Interpreting the host range of
 422 *Peristenus digoneutis* and *Peristenus relictus* (Hymenoptera: Braconidae) biological control
 423 agents of *Lygus* spp. (Hemiptera: Miridae) in North America. Biol Control 57:94-102

424 Mc Evoy (1996) Host specificity and biological pest control. BioSci 46(6):401-405

425 Moeed A, Hickson R, barratt BIP (2006) Principles of environmental risk assessment with emphasis
 426 on the New Zealand perspective. In: Bigler F, Babendreier D, Kuhlmann U (eds)
 427 Environmental impact of invertebrates for biological control of arthropods: methods and risk
 428 assessment. CABI Publishing, Wallingford, UK, pp 241-253

429 Moriya S, Inoue K, Ôtake A, Shiga M, Mabuchi M (1989) Decline of the chestnut gall wasp
 430 population, *Dryocosmus kuriphilus* Yasumatsu (Hymenoptera: Cynipidae) after the
 431 establishment of *Torymus sinensis* Kamijo (Hymenoptera: Torymidae). Appl Entomol Zool
 432 24:231-233

433 Moriya S, Inoue K, Mabuchi M (1990) The use of *Torymus sinensis* to control chestnut gall wasp,
 434 *Dryocosmus kuriphilus*, in Japan. The use of natural enemies to control agricultural pest.
 435 FFTC Book series No. 40

436 Moriya S, Shiga M, Adachi I (2003) Classical biological control of the chestnut gall wasp in Japan.
 437 In: van Driesche RG (ed) Proceedings of the 1st International Symposium on Biological
 438 Control of Arthropods. USDA Forest Service, Washington, pp 407–415

439 Murakami Y, Umeya K, Oho N (1977) A preliminary introduction and released of a parasitoid
440 (Chalcidoidea, Torymidae) of the chestnut gall wasp *Dryocosmus kuriphilus* Yasumatsu. Jpn
441 J Appl Entomol Zool 21:197-203

442 Nadel H, Daane KM, Hoelmer KA, Pickett CH, Johnson MW (2009) Non-target host risk
443 assessment of the idiobiont parasitoid *Bracon celer* (Hymenoptera: Braconidae) for biological
444 control of olive fruit fly in California. Biocontrol Sci Technol 19(7):701-715

445 Onstad DW, McManus ML (1996) Risks of Host Range Expansion by Parasites of Insects. BioSci
446 46(6):430-435

447 Quacchia A, Moriya S, Bosio G, Scapin G, Alma A (2008) Rearing, release and settlement prospect
448 in Italy of *Torymus sinensis*, the biological control agent of the chestnut gall wasp *Dryocosmus*
449 *kuriphilus*. BioControl 53:829-839

450 Quacchia A, Ferracini C, Nicholls JA, Piazza E, Saladini MA, Tota F, Melika G, Alma A (2013)
451 Chalcid parasitoid community associated with the invading pest *Dryocosmus kuriphilus* in
452 north-western Italy. Insect Conserv Diver 6 (2):114-123

453 Quacchia A, Moriya S, Askew R, Schönrogge K (2014) *Torymus sinensis*: biology, host range and
454 hybridization. Acta Hort 1043:105-111

455 Strand MR, Obricky JJ (1996) Host Specificity of Insect Parasitoids and Predators. BioSci
456 46(6):422-429

457 van Driesche RG, Murray TJ (2004) Overview of testing schemes and designs used to estimate host
458 ranges. In: Assessing host ranges of parasitoids and predators used for classical biological
459 control: a guide to best practice. R.G. Van Driesche, T. Murray, and R. Reardon (eds), Forest
460 Health technology Enterprise Team, Morgantown, West Virginia, USA, pp. 68-89

461 van Lenteren JC, Bale J, Bigler F, Hokkanen HMT, Loomans AJM (2006) Assessing risks of
462 releasing exotic biological control agents of arthropod pests. Annu Rev Entomol 51:609–634

463 Withers TM, Brown LB (2005) Behavioral and physiological processes affecting outcomes of host
464 range testing. In: Assessing host ranges of parasitoids and predators used for classical

465 biological control: a guide to best practice. R.G. Van Driesche, T. Murray, and R. Reardon
466 (eds), Forest Health technology Enterprise Team, Morgantown, West Virginia, USA, pp. 40-55
467 Wyckhuys KAG, Koch RL, Kula RR, Heimpel GE (2009) Potential exposure of a classical
468 biological control agent of the soybean aphid, *Aphis glycines*, on non-target aphids in North
469 America. Biol Invasions 11:857–871
470
471

472 Table 1 Years of release and coordinates of *T. sinensis* release points in the surveyed sites

Italian regions	Surveyed sites	Year of release	Coordinates
Liguria	Borzonasca	2012	44°26'01.6"N 9°23'45.9"E
	Sassello	2011	44°29'33.7"N 8°33'17.9"E
Piemonte	Molare	2012	44°34'40.2"N 8°36'10.5"E
	Pianfei	2008	44°19'41.2"N 7°40'58.9"E
Toscana	Marradi	2010	44°04'53.1"N 11°38'17.8"E
	Piazza al Serchio	2011	44°10'31.8"N 10°17'14.9"E
Valle d'Aosta	Arnad	2012	45°38'22.7"N 7°43'41.8"E
	Perloz	2012	45°36'53.9"N 7°48'24.4"E

473

474

475

476

477

478

479

480

481

482

483

484

485

486

487

488

489

490

491

492

493 Table 2 Number of non-target galls collected in the two-year period (2013–2014) from the surveyed
 494 sites according to the species list for host-specificity testing established by EFSA Panel On Plant
 495 Health (2010).

Year	Italian regions	Host plant	Galls species	Generation	No.
2013	Liguria	<i>Quercus robur</i>	<i>Andricus curvator</i>	sexual	1
		<i>Quercus petraea</i>	<i>Biorhiza pallida</i>	sexual	29
	Piemonte	<i>Quercus robur</i>	<i>Andricus curvator</i>	sexual	26
		<i>Quercus cerris</i>	<i>Andricus cydoniae</i>	sexual	205
		<i>Quercus robur</i>	<i>Andricus inflator</i>	sexual	46
		<i>Quercus cerris</i>	<i>Andricus multiplicatus</i>	sexual	12
		<i>Quercus robur</i>	<i>Biorhiza pallida</i>	sexual	132
		<i>Rosa canina</i>	<i>Diplolepis rosae</i>	asexual	17
		<i>Quercus robur</i>	<i>Neuroterus quercusbaccarum</i>	sexual	2
	Toscana	<i>Quercus cerris</i>	<i>Andricus lucidus</i>	sexual	1
		<i>Quercus cerris</i>	<i>Andricus multiplicatus</i>	sexual	41
		<i>Rosa spp.</i>	<i>Diplolepis rosae</i>	asexual	1
	Valle d'Aosta	<i>Quercus robur</i>	<i>Andricus curvator</i>	sexual	61
		<i>Quercus cerris</i>	<i>Andricus cydoniae</i>	sexual	2
		<i>Quercus cerris</i>	<i>Andricus grossulariae</i>	sexual	3
		<i>Quercus pubescens</i>	<i>Andricus inflator</i>	sexual	12
		<i>Quercus pubescens</i>	<i>Biorhiza pallida</i>	sexual	317
		<i>Rosa canina</i>	<i>Diplolepis rosae</i>	asexual	6
		<i>Quercus pubescens</i>	<i>Neuroterus quercusbaccarum</i>	sexual	79
2014	Liguria	<i>Quercus robur</i>	<i>Biorhiza pallida</i>	sexual	76
	Piemonte	<i>Quercus robur</i>	<i>Biorhiza pallida</i>	sexual	150
	Toscana	<i>Quercus petraea</i>	<i>Biorhiza pallida</i>	sexual	10
	Valle d'Aosta	<i>Quercus robur</i>	<i>Biorhiza pallida</i>	sexual	142

496
 497
 498
 499
 500
 501
 502
 503
 504

Table 3 Numbers of native torymid species and the exotic *Torymus sinensis* (in bold) emerged from non-target galls collected in the 2-year period (2013–2014) from the surveyed sites.

Year	Italian regions	Gall species	Torymid species emerged	♀♀	♂♂
2013	Liguria	<i>Biorhiza pallida</i>	<i>Torymus affinis</i>	9	6
			<i>Torymus auratus</i>	40	36
			<i>Torymus flavipes</i>	20	3
	Piemonte	<i>Andricus cydoniae</i>	<i>Megastigmus dorsalis</i>	0	1
		<i>Biorhiza pallida</i>	<i>Torymus affinis</i>	10	13
			<i>Torymus auratus</i>	0	2
			<i>Torymus geranii</i>	0	1
			<i>Torymus sinensis</i>	0	3
		<i>Diplolepis rosae</i>	<i>Torymus auratus</i>	1	3
	Toscana	<i>Andricus lucidus</i>	<i>Megastigmus dorsalis</i>	4	0
		<i>Andricus multiplicatus</i>	<i>Megastigmus dorsalis</i>	0	1
	Valle d'Aosta	<i>Andricus curvator</i>	<i>Torymus flavipes</i>	27	44
		<i>Andricus cydoniae</i>	<i>Torymus flavipes</i>	1	0
		<i>Biorhiza pallida</i>	<i>Torymus affinis</i>	3	7
			<i>Torymus auratus</i>	11	14
			<i>Torymus flavipes</i>	105	105
			<i>Torymus geranii</i>	0	2
		<i>Neuroterus quercusbaccarum</i>	<i>Torymus flavipes</i>	24	50
2014	Liguria	<i>Biorhiza pallida</i>	<i>Torymus auratus</i>	4	8
	Piemonte	<i>Biorhiza pallida</i>	<i>Torymus affinis</i>	23	40
			<i>Torymus auratus</i>	2	0
	Toscana	<i>Biorhiza pallida</i>	<i>Torymus affinis</i>	7	4
			<i>Torymus auratus</i>	3	1
	Valle d'Aosta	<i>Biorhiza pallida</i>	<i>Torymus affinis</i>	84	69
			<i>Torymus auratus</i>	2	2
			<i>Torymus flavipes</i>	0	2

Table 4 Mean number (\pm SE) of host location, attempted oviposition, and oviposition events engaged in by *T. sinensis* females comparing non-target oak galls⁺ and *D. kuriphilus* galls (control) recorded during 1 h observation periods in no choice oviposition trials over a two-year period (2013–2014). Means were compared for each non-target species using a paired t-tests for dependent samples; P<0.05 *; P<0.01 **; P<0.001***.

Year	Non-target species compared to the control	No.	Host location	Attempted oviposition	Oviposition
2013	<i>Andricus curvator</i>	30	0.33 \pm 0.09***	0.00	0.00***
	<i>Dryocosmus kuriphilus</i>	30	0.97 \pm 0.10	0.00	0.83 \pm 0.07
	<i>Biorhiza pallida</i>	20	1.40 \pm 0.29	0.15 \pm 0.08	0.00***
	<i>Dryocosmus kuriphilus</i>	20	1.45 \pm 0.15	0.00	0.80 \pm 0.09
	<i>Andricus grossulariae</i>	20	0.85 \pm 0.15**	0.00	0.00***
	<i>Dryocosmus kuriphilus</i>	20	1.55 \pm 0.17	0.00	0.90 \pm 0.07
	<i>Neuroterus quercusbaccarum</i>	20	0.80 \pm 0.12***	0.00	0.00***
	<i>Dryocosmus kuriphilus</i>	20	1.90 \pm 0.22	0.00	0.80 \pm 0.09
2014	<i>Andricus curvator</i>	20	0.35 \pm 0.11**	0.00	0.30 \pm 0.11**
	<i>Dryocosmus kuriphilus</i>	20	0.95 \pm 0.15	0.00	0.80 \pm 0.09
	<i>Biorhiza pallida</i>	20	1.50 \pm 0.44	0.25 \pm 0.14	0.00***
	<i>Dryocosmus kuriphilus</i>	20	1.55 \pm 0.18	0.00	0.90 \pm 0.07


⁺The selection was based on the species list for host-specificity testing established by EFSA Panel On Plant Health (2010)

Figure 1 Location of the sampling sites (black dots). The inset indicates the location of the four surveyed regions in Italy.

Figure 2 Responses of *T. sinensis* (number of responding females in bars) in a Y-tube olfactometer to the odours of chestnut gall and non-target galls. Numbers in bars represent individuals that moved toward the volatiles. Chi-square statistics (* P <0.05; df=1) tested the hypothesis that the distribution of side arm choices deviated from a null model where odour sources were chosen with equal frequency.

532

533



534

535

536

537

538

Andricus
curvator



Andricus
cydoniae



Andricus
grossulariae




Andricus
multiplicatus



Biorhiza
pallida



Neuroterus
quercusbaccarum



Dryocosmus
kuriphilus



Dryocosmus
kuriphilus



Dryocosmus
kuriphilus



Dryocosmus
kuriphilus



Dryocosmus
kuriphilus



Dryocosmus
kuriphilus

